

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40-41, 43-44, 52-54, 56, 76-77, 79-80, 88-90 and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jain et al. (US 6,567,980).

Claims 3, 6-7, 9-12, 18-36, 38-39, 42, 45-56, 48-51, 57-75, 78, 81-82, 84-87 and 93-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain (US 6,567,980).

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of the allowable subject matter in claims 8, 16, 47, 55, 83, and 91.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40-41, 43-44, 52-54, 56, 76-77, 79-80, 88-90 and 92 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Jain.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Jain teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40-41, 43-44, 52-54, 56, 76-77, 79-80, 88-90 and 92. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain fails to teach or suggest at least one of the claim limitation recited in each of claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40-41, 43-44, 52-54, 56, 76-77, 79-80, 88-90 and 92.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a method of displaying multimedia information stored in a multimedia document on a display, the multimedia information comprising information of a plurality of types including information of a first type and information of a second type, the method comprising:

displaying a graphical user interface (GUI) on the display;

displaying, in a first area of the GUI, a representation of the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document, the displayed representation of the multimedia information comprising a representation of information of the first type and a representation of information of the second type;

displaying a first lens covering a first portion of the first area; and

displaying, in a second area of the GUI, a representation of multimedia information displayed in the first portion of the first area, the representation of multimedia information displayed in the second area comprising a portion of the representation of information of the first type covered by the first lens and a portion of the representation of information of the second type covered by the first lens.

Applicants respectfully submit that Jain does not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in claim 1.

A First Lens

Claim 1 recites, in part, displaying a first lens covering a first portion of the first area. In the Office Action, the Examiner makes the following associations between features recited in claim 1 and alleged teachings of Jain:

- a first area of the GUI \leftrightarrow “(figure 2, 172)”
- a first lens covering a first portion of the first area \leftrightarrow “(the first lens covers the frame 172)”

The Examiner argues that a user puts a first lens covering the desired frame 172 by capturing and selecting the desired video clip frame 172. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Initially, Applicants respectfully note that Jain refers to element 172 in FIG. 2 as “panel 172,” rather than the “frame 172” used by the Examiner. The term “frame” as discussed in Jain typically refers to a single still-image of a video sequence, whereas the term “panel” typically refers to a portion of the graphical user interface.

Next, Jain simply discloses that “A panel 172 displays the live video being digitized, with play, stop, etc. controls that interact remotely with the analog source via a deck

controller 240 (FIG. 3).” The Examiner merely points to FIG. 2 of Jain, and alleges that the user puts a first lens as recited in claim 1 over the desired “frame 172.” Applicants respectfully request the Examiner substantiate the above allegation using evidence in the disclosure of Jain. Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2), when a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The Examiner has not provided the name of a object/component shown in FIG. 2 distinct from panel 172, a reference number to an object/component shown in FIG. 2 distinct from panel 172, a coordinate system to locate such an object/component in FIG. 2 distinct from panel 172, or a column/paragraph reference to written support in Jain to establish that FIG. 2 of Jain actually shows an alleged first lens as recited in claim 1 covering the panel 172 of Jain which is different and distinct from the panel 172 of Jain.

Applicants previously noted that a picture or drawing must show all the claimed structural features, and how they are put together. Jockmus v. Leviton, 28 F.2d 812 (2d Cir. 1928). The Examiner has attempted to explain “how” a first lens as recited in claim 1 likely would be put together with panel 172 in that a “user puts a first lens over the desired frame 172.” However, the Examiner has not provided evidence in Jain’s disclosure of such an act by a user. Furthermore, FIG. 2 fails to show a user, and anything else over panel 172. As discussed above, the written support of Jain merely provides one ordinarily skilled in the art the understanding that panel 172 “displays the live video being digitized, with play, stop, etc. controls that interact remotely with the analog source via a deck controller 240.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain fails to teach or suggest displaying a first lens covering a first portion of a first area as recited in claim 1.

Displaying a Representation of Multimedia Information Covered by the First Lens

Claim 1 recites, in part, displaying, in a second area of the GUI, a representation of multimedia information displayed in the first portion of the first area, the representation of multimedia information displayed in the second area comprising a portion of the representation of information of the first type covered by the first lens and a portion of the representation of

information of the second type covered by the first lens. In the Office Action, the Examiner makes the following associations between the above-recited features of claim 1 and alleged teachings of Jain:

- a first area of the GUI \leftrightarrow “(figure 2, 172)”
- information of the first type \leftrightarrow image displayed in panel 172
- information of the second type \leftrightarrow caption text displayed in panel 172
- displaying a representation of the multimedia information in a second area \leftrightarrow “(figure 2, area 176)”

The Examiner alleges that displaying a captured frame in panel 176 allegedly discloses the feature of “displaying, in a second area of the GUI, a representation of multimedia information displayed in the first portion of the first area, the representation of multimedia information displayed in the second area comprising a portion of the representation of information of the first type covered by the first lens and a portion of the representation of information of the second type covered by the first lens” as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain does not disclose that a first lens as recited in claim 1 covers panel 172. Next, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain does not teach or suggest that a representation of multimedia information displayed in a first portion of a first area of a GUI is displayed in a second area of the GUI as recited in claim 1. The representation of multimedia information displayed in the second area recited in claim 1 includes a portion of the representation of information of the first type covered by the first lens and a portion of the representation of information of the second type covered by the first lens. Jain does not teach or suggest an area of a GUI that displays a representation of a first and second type of information that is covered by a lens in another area of the GUI.

Jain discloses that panel 172 displays the live video being digitized. (Jain: Col. 4, lines 26-28). Jain further discloses that keyframes extracted during the capture process (e.g., frames from the live video displayed in panel 172) are displayed in a panel 176, while the corresponding close-caption text and timecodes are displayed in a panel 178. (Jain: Col. 4, lines

29-31). Thus, according to the written description of Jain, the panel 176, pointed to by the Examiner as allegedly including the first and second type of information recited in claim 1, only includes keyframes extracted during the capture process. Corresponding close-caption text and timecodes are displayed in panel 178, which is different from panel 176.

Moreover, Jain does not disclose that a representation of caption text allegedly displayed in panel 172 is displayed in panel 176 as stated by the Examiner. The Examiner points to a likely text box in panel 172, and alleges that it contains "caption text." Even assuming, arguendo, that the panel 172 includes "caption text" as alleged by the Examiner, the caption text is provided by the user, rather than being a representation of the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document as recited in claim 1. Jain further discloses that the remaining columns 190, 192, 194 of FIG. 2 in Jain are an example of a user defined schema of labels to describe the clip. Thus, it is more likely that any alleged caption text in panel 172 is) provided by the user rather than being part of the live video, and 2) displayed in columns 190, 192, 194 rather than in panel 176 with the frames of video as alleged by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Jain does not teach or suggest displaying, in a second area of the GUI, a representation of multimedia information displayed in the first portion of the first area, the representation of multimedia information displayed in the second area comprising a portion of the representation of information of the first type covered by the first lens and a portion of the representation of information of the second type covered by the first lens as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-111

Applicants submit that independent claims 18, 28, 37-40, 57, 67, 76, 93, and 103 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-17, 19-27, 29-36, 41-56, 58-66, 68-75, 77-92, 94-102, and 104-111 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 18, 28, 40, 57, 67, 76, 93, and 103 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Appl. No. 10/081,129
Amdt. dated June 19, 2007
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2179

PATENT

In light of the above deficiencies of Jain, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 3, 6-7, 9-12, 18-36, 38-39, 42, 45-56, 48-51, 57-75, 78, 81-82, 84-87 and 93-111 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Jain.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:m6s
61062880 v1